



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/842,577

04/26/2001

Robert James Lawson

13DV13821

7443

29399 7590 03/30/2004

JOHN S. BEULICK
C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
SUITE 2600
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER

PHAM, HUNG Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/842,577

Applicant(s)

LAWSON ET AL.

Examiner

HUNG Q PHAM

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Claims 1, 2 and 5 were amended in the amendment. The pending claims are 1-20. Claims 17-20 has been withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 2 has been amended in accordance with the suggestion in the First Office Action. The objection of claim 2 is withdrawn.

Claim 5 has been amended by removing the recitation of *within a pre-determined time frame*. The rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC § 112 is withdrawn.

As argued by applicants on pages 7-9, the argument is to reverse the Office Rejection by asserting Kraenzel and Behera does not disclose the limitations of claim 1, especially the new added features. Examiner respectfully traverses, and the rejection is detailed as below.

In response to applicants' argument on pages 10-14 and 19-20 that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kraezel method is to control access to database objects by using access control list. Behera method is also to control access to a database by setting up ACL rules for access control list. The lacking of access rules in Kraezel access control list could be

Art Unit: 2172

fixed by the Behera ACL rules in order to increase the security of the method and the system.

In response to applicant's argument on page 10-14 that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5-15 on pages 16-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Election/Restrictions

2. This application contains claims 17-20 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 8. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 5-11 and 3-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039].

Regarding to claim 5, Kraenzel teaches a method for generating a profile of a network user based on a user's access privileges stored in an access control list (ACL). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-18). As shown in FIG. 1, a profile compiling/updating object 32 may use the information received from user affinity determining object 30 to generate a user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 2, lines 65-67) as the step of *providing capabilities for a user to request access to information that the user currently does not have access to*. To prevent access to objects containing, for example, confidential or proprietary information, users may be assigned levels of access privileges. Access privileges may be, for example, read-only, edit, etc. Access privileges may be assigned by a system

Art Unit: 2172

administrator and stored in an access control list or ACL (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 18-26). As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements set by the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object, otherwise goes to step 162-164, and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user (Kraenzel, FIG. 3, Col. 4, lines 20-31). As seen, the state of a request either for retrieving the request object or denying is tracked by branching to step 158 or 162 based on the obtained user's access privileges for the object(s) as *a decision from an owner of the data requested*, if the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, the requested object is implemented by presenting the object at step 160, or a denied notification to the user at step 164. In other words, the technique as discussed performs the steps of *tracking a status of the request; obtaining a decision from an owner of the data requested; implementing the decision; and notifying the user of the decision*. Returning to FIG. 3, *if* step 156 determines that the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), *the user is denied access*, and step 162 *prompts the user to complete a request for quick approval*, and *the request for quick approval is subjected* to step 166 as *an internal exception access process*. Step 166 determines if additional privileges as *pre-established criteria* have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, the ACL is updated to retrieve and present the requested object to the user, or in other

words, *the quick approval is approved based on pre-established criteria* (Kraenzel, Col. 4, Lines 31-43).

Regarding to claim 6, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *obtaining at least one of an approval decision and a disapproval decision* (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding to claim 7, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *reviewing and auditing the user access* (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding to claim 8, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *creating a consistent security model that includes centralized administration of security of the system and uses single user profile and privilege for accessing different applications* (Col. 3, lines 1-15; Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding to claim 9, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *creating user profiles; providing access control to data associated with user profiles; defining permissions based on a user identifier associated with user profiles; and developing a specification for user interfaces* (Kraenzel, Col. 3, line 1-Col. 4, line 13).

Regarding to claim 10, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step *providing administration of a common security model for access control and event notification* (Kraenzel, FIG. 3).

Regarding to claim 11, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *updating profiles automatically on at least one of a pre-determined timed interval and a change in organization hierarchy* (Kraenzel, Col. 3, lines 33-42).

Regarding to claim 13, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *generating access list reports that identify accessible and non-accessible data and restrictions for access* (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 20-26 and Col. 2, lines 12-16).

Regarding to claim 14, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *retrieving information from the centralized database in response to a specific inquiry from an administrator* (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Behera [USP 6,535,879].

Regarding to claim 1, Kraenzel teaches a method for generating a profile of a network user based on a user's access privileges stored in an access control list (ACL). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-18). As shown in FIG. 1, a profile compiling/updating object 32 may use the information received from user affinity determining object 30 to

Art Unit: 2172

generate a user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 2, lines 65-67) as the step of *creating an electronic profile for a user within a centralized database*. To prevent access to objects containing, for example, confidential or proprietary information, users may be assigned levels of access privileges. Access privileges may be, for example, read-only, edit, etc. Access privileges may be assigned by a system administrator and stored in an access control list or ACL (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 18-26) as the step of *creating an ACL as an electronic profile for data within the centralized database*. As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements set by the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-31). As seen, the procedure for accessing a requested object as discussed as *methodology is established for user access*. In order to grant access to a requested object or *making a decision with reference to the user access*, access privileges in ACL and user profile are compared, and the procedure is processed as at step 156-158 to *complete an evaluation based on the electronic profiles, and operating methodology in response to a request from the user for access*. Returning to FIG. 3, *if* step 156 determines that the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), *the user is denied access*, and step 162 *prompts the user to complete a request for quick approval*, and *the request for quick approval is subjected* to step 166 as *an internal exception access process*. Step 166 determines if additional

Art Unit: 2172

privileges as *pre-established criteria* have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, the ACL is updated to retrieve and present the requested object to the user, or in other words, *the quick approval is approved based on pre-established criteria* (Kraenzel, Col. 4, Lines 31-43). Kraenzel does not explicitly teach *pre-determined rules are established*, and *the evaluation based on pre-determined rules*. Behera teaches a method to control access via properties system by providing ACL rules based on the properties associated with the entries (Behera, Col. 1, line 64-Col. 2, line 5). Behera further discloses the step of *establishing pre-determined rules* (Behera, Col. 4, lines 25-54) and *evaluating the pre-determined rules* to grant access to a user (Behera, Col. 6, lines 13-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel method by applying the access rules to the ACL as taught by Behera in order to grant access to a user or a group to a particular attribute object in the database.

Regarding to claim 3, Kraenzel and Behera teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, Kraenzel further discloses the step of *creating data profiles based on at least one of Data Elements, Data Tags, Rules of Access, an Approver's Name for Each Rule of Access, Rules of Exclusion, an Exception List, and Field Tags* (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-26).

Regarding to claim 4, Kraenzel and Behera teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, Behera further discloses the step of *establishing pre-*

Art Unit: 2172

determined rules in the centralized database based on at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines; and establishing methodology to ensure timely and accurate decision making based on criteria established by the management (Behera, Col. 4, lines 26-55).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Behera [USP 6,535,879], CERN [Administrative Information Services, Oracle HR] and Lillibridge [USP 6,195,698 B1].

Regarding to claim 2, Kraenzel and Behera teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, but fails to disclose the step of *creating an electronic profile based on information available from at least one an OHR Application and an RFCA Application*. CERN teaches an OHR application and Lillibridge teaches an RFCA Application (Lillibridge, Col. 8, lines 35-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Behera method by using information from OHR Application and RFCA Application to build the electronic profile in order to distribute object to a user or a group via IP address.

Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039].

Regarding to claim 12, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel does not explicitly teach the step of *updating profiles automatically when a user transfers departments*. However, as disclosed by Kraenzel, profile system 14 may automatically update a user's profile by periodically checking the ACL of the network. This may be performed on a routine basis, or on a random basis, when requested by a system administrator, or at various other instances. System 14 may also use the above process for updating a user profile by simply adding supplemental information to the user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 3, lines 33-42). Thus, when a user transfers departments, system administrator updates the ACL, and user profile will be updated automatically. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Stockwell method by including the step of updating profiles when a user transfers department in order to control access to a database.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Stockwell et al. [USP 5,950,195].

Regarding to claim 15, Kraenzel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel fails to teach *the client system and the server system are*

connected via a network and wherein the network is one of a wide area network, a local area network, an intranet and the Internet. Stockwell discloses *the client system and the server system are connected via a network and wherein the network is one of a wide area network, a local area network, an intranet and the Internet* (Stockwell, Col. 4, lines 21-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel method by including a network in order to process the method for the remote users.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behera [USP 6,535,879] in view of Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039 B1].

Regarding to claim 16, Behera teaches a LDAP as a database configured to be protected from access by using Access Control List or ACL. The Directory Server Administrator creates basic ACL rules that grant specific users access to certain information in the directory (Behera, Col. 3, lines 9-37). Behera further discloses the ACL rules that comprises a group based access guidelines based on the attributes to set up the rule (Behera, Col. 4, lines 42-44) as *data corresponding to at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines*. As in Behera, Col. 4, Lines 40-41, in order to allow access to a specific user, user name and access privileges such as read, write are used

ACL: (list of attrs) (allow(read) user= "prasanta")

As seen, a user can retrieve data in the database corresponding to the read applications, the read application is cross-referenced against an access privilege (read) as unique identifiers, and user name as data corresponding user that cross-references user name against "prasanta" as unique identifier. In other words, the technique as discussed indicates *data corresponding to applications that cross-references the applications data against unique identifiers; data corresponding to users that cross-references the users data against unique identifiers*. Although the directory server matches the desired attributes within the specified attribute fieldname with the user's attributes for allowing access to the directory entry only if the user has the desired attribute values. Behera fails to teach *data corresponding to various methodologies that facilitates accurate decision making*. Kraenzel teaches a method for generating a profile of a network user based on a user's access privileges stored in an access control list (ACL). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-18). As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements set by the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user. If, however, step 156 determines that the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), step 162 determines whether the user has

Art Unit: 2172

requested additional privileges from the system administrator. If additional privileges have not been requested, step 164 notifies the user that access has been denied. Otherwise, step 166 determines if additional privileges have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, step 168 updates the ACL and may proceed to retrieve and present the requested object using steps 158 and 160 respectively. If step 166 determines that additional privileges have not been granted, the user may be notified that access has been denied using step 164 (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43). As seen, the procedure for accessing a requested object of FIG. 3 as *various methodologies that facilitates accurate decision making*, the retrieved object and notified data are data corresponding to *various methodologies*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Behera technique by using the method of access as taught by Kraenzel in order to process an access request of a user.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2172


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q PHAM whose telephone number is 703-605-4242. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner Hung Pham
March 18, 2004


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER